PTO/SB/08A(10-01)
Approved for use through 19/31/2012, OMB 851-0031
US Patent & Tradement Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Substitute for form 1449A/PTO	Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no particular are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid CMG control number. Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (Use as many sheets as necessary)	Application Number	10/632,138	
, , , , , , ,	Filing Date	July 31, 2003	
(()	First Named Inventor	Youker, Nick	
JUN 0 6 2005 °	Group Art Unit	2841	
PAR July	Examiner Name	Unknown	
Sheet 1 of 1	Attorney Docket No: 2	79.659US1	

US PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner USP Document Initial Number		Publication Date	Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document	Filing Date If Appropriate		
	US-5,213,522	05/25/1993	Kojima, Y.	07/13/1992		
	US-6,529,103	03/04/2003	Brendel, R. L., et al.	09/07/2000		

EXAMINER

Tuan Dilh

PTO/SB/064(10:01)
Approved for use through 10/31/2002, OMB 651-0031
US Patent & Tudemen's Office U.S. DEPARTMENT OF CORMERCE
on of information under a "STATE PROVIDED IN THE PROVIDED IN THE

	Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are	required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.	
Substitute for form 1449A/PTO INFORMATION DISCLOSURE	Complete if Known		
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT	Application Number	10/632,138	
(Use as many sheets as necessary)	Filing Date	July 31, 2003	
	First Named Inventor	Youker, Nick	
1 6 2004 24	Group Art Unit		
B OE , OF	Examiner Name	Unknown	
Sheet 1 of 1	Attorney Docket No: 2	79.659US1	

	US PATENT DOCUMENTS					
Examiner Initial *	USP Document Number	Publication Date	Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document	Filing Date If Appropriate		
	US- 2003/0191505 A1	10/09/2003	Gryzwa, M., et al.	04/09/2002		
	US-4,152,540	05/01/1979	Duncan, D A., et al.	05/03/1977		
	US-4,525,766	06/25/1985	Peterson, K. E.	01/25/1984		
	US-4,536,820	08/20/1985	Binder, P. B., et al.	03/29/1984		
	US-4,678,868	07/07/1987	Kraska, R. E., et al.	07/30/1984		
	US-4,934,366	06/19/1990	Truex, B. E., et al.	09/19/1989		
	US-5,023,577	06/11/1991	Drake, R. G.	05/17/1990		
	US-5,041,900	08/20/1991	Chen, F., et al.	06/15/1989		
	US-5,163,428	11/17/1992	Pless, B. D.	10/11/1990		
	US-5,175,067	12/29/1992	Taylor, William J., et al.	11/09/1990		
	US-5,333,095	07/26/1994	Stevenson, R A., et al.	05/03/1993		
	US-5,336,242	08/09/1994	Zadeh, A. E.	05/26/1993		
	US-5,406,444	04/11/1995	Selfried, L. M., et al.	03/29/1993		
	US-5,620,476	04/15/1997	Truex, B. E., et al.	11/13/1995		
	US-5,650,759	07/22/1997	Hittman, F., et al.	11/09/1995		
	US-5,658,319	08/19/1997	Kroli, M. W.	05/13/1996		
	US-5,683,434	11/04/1997	Archer, S. T.	12/06/1996		
	US-5,683,435	11/04/1997	Truex, B. E., et al.	11/13/1996		
	US-5,817,130	10/06/1998	Cox, T. J., et al.	02/20/1997		
	US-5,851,222	12/22/1998	Taylor, W. J., et al.	02/11/1998		
	US-5,867,361	02/02/1999	Wolf, W. D., et al.	12/18/1997		
	US-5,870,272	02/09/1999	Seifried, L. M., et al.	05/06/1997		
	US-5,871,513	02/16/1999	Taylor, W. J., et al.	04/30/1997		
	US-5,896,267	04/20/1999	Hittman, F., et al.	07/10/1997		
	US-5,905,627	05/18/1999	Brendel, R. L., et al.	09/10/1997		
	US-5,999,398	12/07/1999	Maki, A. S., et al.	06/24/1998		
	US-6,008,980	12/28/1999	Stevenson, R. A., et al.	11/13/1997		
	US-6,031,710	02/29/2000	Wolf, William D., et al.	12/18/1997		
	US-6,044,300	03/28/2000	Gray, N. D.	06/30/1997		
	US-6,076,017	06/13/2000	Taylor, W. J., et al.	02/11/1998		
	US-6,090,503	07/18/2000	Taylor, W. J., et al.	04/16/1998		

TuanDir **EXAMINER**

DATE CONSIDERED

§ 1.56 Duty to disclose information material to patentability.

- (a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclose information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is canceled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is canceled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application. There is no duty to submit information which is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability of disclose all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by §§ 1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:
 - (1) prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and
 - (2) the closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.
- (b) Under this section, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made of record in the application, and
 - (1) It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or
 - (2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the applicant takes in:
 - (i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or
 - (ii) Asserting an argument of patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

- (c) Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application within the meaning of this section are:
 - (1) Each inventor named in the application:
 - (2) Each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application; and
 - (3) Every other person who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application.
- (d) Individuals other than the attorney, agent or inventor may comply with this section by disclosing information to the attorney, agent, or inventor.

TuanDive

1-12-06